



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,389	07/11/2000	Takaei Kihara	36856.324	1302
7590	08/02/2004			EXAMINER
Christopher a Bennett Keating & Bennett LLP 10400 Eaton Place ste 312 Fairfax, VA 22030			PENDLETON, BRIAN,T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2644	
			DATE MAILED: 08/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/613,389	Applicant(s) KIHARA, TAKAEI
	Examiner Brian T. Pendleton	Art Unit 2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 2-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see the declaration, filed 5/10/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 2-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Nakamura et al, US Patent 4,344,503 (hereafter referenced as Nakamura '503).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 2-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura '196 in view of Nakamura '503. Nakamura '196 discloses an apparatus comprising spherical vibrator 12, first baffle board 26 in which the vibrator 12 is mounted and second baffle board 38 (which is a reflected but can act as a baffle) and spacers 32. The apparatus does not disclose that the vibrator has a natural resonant frequency higher than the desired bandwidth of the loudspeaker. Nakamura '503 teaches in the abstract that a transducer with an elevated resonance frequency improves the frequency characteristic of the transducer. Column 2 lines 38-62 discloses a transducer made of ceramic material, thereby making it a piezoelectric transducer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the vibrator 12 of Nakamura '992 using a ceramic material and having a natural resonance frequency higher than the bandwidth of the loudspeaker for the purpose of improving the frequency

response of the loudspeaker. Claim 2 is met. Per claim 12, the baffle 26 is circular. As to claim 3, inherently, the baffle boards have natural resonant frequencies lower than the piezoelectric vibrator, whose natural resonant frequency is 25 kHz. Regarding claims 4 and 5, the shapes of the baffle boards are different from each other, therefore they exhibit different resonant frequencies. Regarding claims 6-8, inherently the space between the baffle boards will have a resonance frequency different from that of the baffle boards and the vibrator. Since the resonance frequency of the vibrator is above audible hearing, it is higher than that of the space. As to claims 9 and 10, one of ordinary skill in the art would have realized the claimed configuration through experimentation and design to optimize the sound characteristic of the speaker for a particular application. Lastly, per claim 11, references do not teach four spacers. Nevertheless, that feature is one of obvious design choice that one of ordinary skill in the art would have made without undue experimentation. One particular number of spacers do not give unexpected results over any other number of spacers.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian T. Pendleton whose telephone number is (703) 305-9509. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W. Isen can be reached on (703) 305-4386. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

3-2-2
btp

BRIAN PENDLETON
PATENT EXAMINER